

M-1120 Music Berkeley Friday, Jan. 20, 1967

We do a little bit like in New York. In New York On Friday evening is what we call Group IV. It's a little different from the other groups. Because as you know we have three others and the first one is for the, to use Gurdjieff's terminology, esoteric; the second group is mesoteric; and the third group is exoteric. I don't have a name for the fourth group, but the characteristic is that I don't have to answer any questions. And that I can select any kind of a subject that I want to talk about and usually you might say dictated by listening to ~~some~~ some tapes or maybe a subject that we have discussed at any one of the meetings which I think needs a little more elucidation. So I have freedom on an evening like that to, to talk, and not too long and usually it ends up with drinking to the health of somebody or something. Well, that we cannot do because we have no Armagnac and we have to dispense with it. So we won't have the necessity even of ending it that way. But what I want to say just a few words about music because it's appropriate. It belongs to art of course and we talked about that yesterday. Music, of course, is a means of communicating. It is a language of a certain kind. Surely it is not words. Sounds perhaps. It is more than sounds because it is not only a combination of several and a certain form of harmony or maybe cacophonically arranged, but also it has in it many other qualities of depth, a certain volume, what we call touch, what we call singing through by means of the pedal, aside from melodies or special combinations of sounds in certain forms of harmony which because of its resolution and linking it up together can ~~a~~ form then, you might say, a sentence or ~~sank~~ sometimes we call it phrasing. A certain rhythm, a cadence, a certain way of up and down indicating that there is emphasis on one thing or less on another. But you see the question is

now, if that is a language, how do we listen to it and how can you take it in such a way that you can understand it. Because plainly it is not just hearing. If you do hear it, very often with your ears, you will hear differently but mostly we use the ears in order to register the sound in your mind and then get into your mind in some way. And immediately in your ordinary mind you start to associate with that what you have heard already before. You start to recognize it, you compare it, it is something like this, something like something else that you do remember. It produces sometimes because of a melody a certain other kind of a memory with which that melody is associated, or a similar kind of music that reminds you of something that Mozart or Bach or whoever has written before. And then it is produced in you in a certain state in which you then by the association start to give it a name and the memory then recalls certain events of yourself in which you of course were sometimes emotionally involved or in an event that you remember. I think music should never be taken that way. It is always taken that way really, and the difficulty I think is because of the kind of music you hear. It is very often an interpretation of someone else who has written it. It's quite interesting to see that music as far as art is concerned is quite fundamentally different compared to what we call art when we discuss painting. In music it is allowed that you play what someone else has written for you. And of course I leave alone now that what is done by composer when he plays his own music. That is a different thing. But that happens very seldom as most of our concerts are based on performing artists who play then in a certain way Chopin or whoever the way they understand it or interpret it. And for the composer he tries to indicate how it ought to be played by making little signs and ~~it~~ ritortando and this has to be in accordance with a certain cadence

or a certain tremolo, emphasis, fortissimo and so forth. He tries to guide it because he has a perfect right to try to tell you how to, how to play it because he wrote it. Now I think much of this came when there were several pieces of orchestra together for which then a certain organization was necessary in order for each different person to play it in harmony with the others. And with that I think it became a performance, because a composer could never play whatever he starts to write for different instruments together. And maybe that has gone over into piano or violin music or when you have single instruments. And it may also be the poverty on the part of ourselves that we feel a little bit more at home in something that has already been played and was liked and that we attach, kind of, our name to what someone else already has done. In painting it is just the other way. Paintings always has to be original and very seldom that you will want a copy of the Rembrandt's Nightwatch or whatever to be shown as your own; it goes as a copy and it is considered a study. So why this is really is, in music as we now perform it, I don't know but in doing it I think we miss really the opportunity of how music should be. Music should come from a person as he is in a certain state, playing or whatever he does in the music, even singing; that he gives at such a time that what is alive in him and it should be a direct route to a person who listens to it and not via another person who reinterprets even if he does it with the best of his knowledge and the best of his intention. And you might say that in an extreme case that the person who becomes a performer and plays let's say Beethoven all the time, starts to look like Beethoven in the end. And of course there are examples of that. Frederick (name unclear) for instance in Europe who played Beethoven and nothing else but Beethoven and concentrated on that, started to look like him. I don't

know if he got deaf but in any event he looked like Beethoven sitting on the piano, at the piano. But these cases are very seldom because most of the composers are supposed to play almost anything under the sun. A little bit of classical, a little bit of modern, a little bit of unknown somebody, and in general they have to be experts and they have to play Mozart as well as Chopin as well as Debussy as well as Scriabin as well as someone else and particularly the modern music which of course many of them don't understand at all. And, the result is very often that they cannot really do justice to whatever they are playing and moreover they have a great difficulty in emphasizing the brilliancy of playing as explained by that technique, and in that way they miss the opportunity of expressing emotions because they cannot feel and refeel, as it were, what someone else has felt for them before. And it always will remain a second-hand kind of a performance. The reason I say this is that I think music as we know it is really not put in the right place. And that is why I don't want to play anything that belongs to someone else. I would like to play something that is, poor as it is, still my own because it has to be the representation of something that is alive in me. Now what is alive and how can one communicate it? In the first place when it is original you will not be able so easily to put a tag on it. And you would have to avoid, even, in your own mind to try to analyze it in that way and to start comparing it. In other words that what you hear with your brain, the registration in your brain of that what are sounds, you should try to register these simply as sounds only. In that way quite pure and to some extent even objectively without any like or dislike with it, without any name, without classification, without trying to remember or comparing it with something you have heard before, even if it is a melody that you remember from your childhood and which you would like

to compare with a little title of, let's say, "Eine Schöne (word unclear)" or "On the tooth of my youngest child" and things of that kind. Naturally, it's all utter nonsense. Music is not to be interpreted that way. This is not the way we listen to a bird. When the bird sings we have absolutely nothing to go by, and even if you would like to bring a note or put a note, "the sounds of a bird" it's really utterly impossible. At most, what you can write up are the vibration rates, but that in itself is not music. Music is composed of course of many, many different things, and the notes are only a very small part. It is the way how a note is produced. There are limitations in an instrument, of course; in a piano, maybe less; in the violin or in the cello maybe a little bit more than the flute, or a piccolo, or oboe or even a recorder, because you are limited to that what is being used for the formation of tones and perhaps the best instrument is your vocal chord if that is well enough developed. And that singing by a man or singing as a choir still has to rank highest as far as the expression of music or sound is concerned when it has to do with something that is alive in one. For that you have to have something if you want to receive it. And what has to be played also if something that is of a different kind in your intellect and, of course, it is ~~is~~ an emotional quality. The emotional quality in music is maybe the way it is ~~atoned~~ <sup>intoned</sup>, that is, the touch, and it is also the way certain combination of notes can sing together. It is sometimes the emphasis of overtones, sometimes the extension of tones as far as the piano is allowed to do it. And if you compare, for instance, an organ with piano, you have exactly that particular kind of ~~a~~ a problem of an organ being able to sustain a note which you

shouldn't it  
be is?

cannot sustain that easily in the piano; at the same time you don't want a note that constantly goes through<sup>s</sup> the whole music, unless that note is fundamental. The only instrument that can do that is the bag pipe. I don't know if you are familiar with it. That has a sustaining note as something that is like a basis—a basis against which the different notes and melodies are projected—and it forms then in the performance and in the performer something quite fundamental which for him becomes, if he does it right, an absoluteness which otherwise cannot be reached. If you are dependent on a piano, and you have rhythm you have a certain melody, you try not to recognize or give it a name, you try to hear it as sound entering into you. Of course it will go through your ear. At~~th~~ your ear there is a chance of dividing, and that what is of an emotional quality can go to your heart direct without having to go through your mind. It's a special way of hearing, but it is quite possible to receive it that way. It is a way of receiving it through your ear. It also can be received through the body itself. And sometimes when the body is open to that, it can reach your heart; and when the body is actually in the state of great relaxation, the body itself can take it as such and start to vibrate in accordance with rates of vibration to the music. This becomes extremely interesting because it is the third way by which music can be taken in. And then the body starts to function; and particularly it is true when there are rhythms—and very notable notable rhythms which affect you—that the body vibrates like a tuning fork, starts to vibrate when another one of the same rate of vibration is struck. You know, you have two tuning forks, you strike one, you put them down and there is another one in the neighborhood, you put them on the same plane, on the same table, and you stop the first one, the other will continue the note. You know that...physics as an

repeat  
of  
literal

experiment... It's exactly ~~kikaxthat~~ like that when one can listen to music in that relaxed state. One has to be very relaxed because otherwise there are too many tensions in the body that would prevent it. The three different ways by which now music of this kind can be received are all simultaneously available in the personality of a person. The more objective one can be, the better it will be in your mind; the more you can be relaxed the better it will be as an emotional quality and the possibility of reaching your heart, and the more relaxed again you are the more chance there is that actually your body itself starts to take part in it and becomes you might say part of the music because it starts to vibrate on its own. This is true of receiving it. When one listens in that way, the three effects on one can be combined. They are not combined in any particular way of harmony as we know it and there is no prescription because it depends on how a person is. Each person is different. Don't make a mistake about that. And for that reason there is no way to compare it. You know for yourself what it is, sometimes you cannot put it in words even, but there is a possibility of being affected. And that being affected does not mean, you have to like it. It means that you have to receive a certain form, I call it simply life, which at first is divided into three parts and is then connected and combined again in me, in order to produce a certain force within you, which perhaps can make you do things or can give you thoughts or, without any question, can give you definite feelings regarding sometimes the rest of mankind, sometimes regarding <sup>what, which</sup> that you are supposed to do, sometimes regarding a possible understanding of what is really necessary for the continuation of conditions as they are, or sometimes the way they ought to be changed. In general, it is a way of feeling love in the real sense, as a love

for one's fellow man. In that way, this kind of an emotion can affect you. How to produce it is another question. It is necessary to send through the music three different waves, three different ways of separating it at the time when it is played into three different sections, each having a special content, a content of the intellect<sup>e</sup>, one of the feeling, and one of the physical center. It does require to some extent, of course, a certain ability of really being, to the extent that one can be objective or awake or conscious. To that extent, the music can really reflect it, and I would say that is the relationship that any person performing, when it has to do with music, in a certain way wishing if he possibly can for an effect but not needing it, that is, a person who plays ought to be complete within himself and not be dependent on the reaction of an audience. And as a matter of fact he should be completely free from it because it doesn't make any difference as far as his own state is concerned. I just want to tell you this because if you can listen this way, I think you might profit by it, and I have no doubt that what I have said is a little different from the way you usually have listened to music or the way you understand it. In my opinion it is the only way by which music can be used as a means of communication. Any other way will remain all the time a reinterpretation of what we have said with words and it isn't. It is a language completely its own. It's a language that even seldom can be translated into ~~xxx~~ another language. It is a language ~~xx~~ that has to stay as such, and that ~~xx~~ any attempt to translate it, to reinterpret it in another way is really deleterious to the music itself. It should as a language stand there, be there, and not be touched in any other way. So now by this time I hope everybody is seated. The rain has held you up? Ya? I'm glad you

are here. All right let's stop that little box.

\* \* \* \* \*

You see how difficult it is to follow that now because you become completely involved in what you hear and you keep on hearing it in the same way you always hear it. And to try even during playing to separate it or even when you make an attempt to try to listen to it as I explained with your heart it's extremely difficult. I think for an unconscious person it is impossible. Only in certain instances that sometimes it reaches an emotional quality. For most of it, it goes to your brain and from there it can go to your heart and also because you might say certain satisfactory tonality, not a question of liking it but something that does not rub you the wrong way or is not disharmony for you as far as you know disharmony; or even anti-~~rhythm~~ rhythm or that what is sometimes is staccato or the ~~and~~ different ways of how one melody mixes with another in different rhythms, three against four or sometimes four against five. Things like that you see are the differences in rhythm which you can hear but are not necessarily cacaphonical. You adjust yourself to that but that is about all that you get. And in order to get something that I talked about, you have to be first relaxed, then the concentration on wanting to follow it and wanting to hear it and not to miss it, makes you constantly tense. And if you now during hearing, you could really breathe, sometimes quite deeply and at that time you simply try to recollect yourself or to ~~mix~~ bring yourself, you bring yourself to a certain unity. In that form of relaxation, by means of breathing, you can accomplish something for yourself that will eliminate the tenseness, that will do away with the concentration; you will actually, as if with this breath, you take a new lease on life. And with that you start then again and again all during the playing if you

want to get out of the playing something you will remain active that way. And that is one of the first requirements that there is something in you that remains active; not this passively listening, passively falling asleep, completely becoming identified with it. It is a certain way which we, of course we are familiar with it; it is the way we usually listen to music. You see, the reason I play is because it is a little different. And it gives you an opportunity during this time to work. Otherwise what is the sense? You can have a record or something and sit and enjoy it in your easy chair. When you come now to music, and I hope we will have more of it when I come back in April, that we will have something of that kind that could be a little bit more continuous; that you will start to learn how to listen and what the effect can be for yourself, for yourself as a result in ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ your life that sometimes, when you happen to think about it, that it can give you an impetus or you recollect or something that then starts as a feeling based on that what you have heard or what you have been affected by, that it gives you, at such a time, a real desire of doing something about your life. Language ultimately, as a form of communication, has to become more and more to try to remind one of the necessity of inner life, inner existence, real being, not surface, not<sup>2</sup> superficial, not on the periphery. It is all right for life as we know it and as we have to live it so often and probably so many hours in the day, but that what really counts is what you are essentially, what you are inside, what you are, what doesn't change really, what is you yourself, permanently, and to have that recalled or to remember that it exists and that, at such a time, that you know it exists when it exists for you, that it has a possibility of remaining because it wants life to be given to it. One has to learn that there is something that has to have attention. That it is not just ordinary existence the way we are so familiar with, and

which, of course, always puts you to sleep. But that besides that maybe there is another kind of way of, I call it, communication. Ultimately, it is that between whatever the spirit could give in order to tell the body what to do — the relationship between the inner life and the outer life, that is, the relationship between that what is essentially yourself and that what you have to manifest. Both belong to us, both is man. We're not one or the other, we are both constantly connected with it, but the emphasis is sometimes much too much on that what is really not worth it, not in the end worth it, not even for a long time in one's life is worth it — only we do it because of a certain momentum, or because of a certain easy way of following the line of least resistance. I would say, once and for all you have to get out of that, that kind of a state, — the state of confusion, as it were, — because the line of least resistance ~~x~~ will not lead you to any particular purpose that you can really go after. You have no purpose when you follow that particular line. You ~~xx~~ let it go and simply as a form of ordinary laissez-faire. That what is on the outside determines then what you are going to be. Man has to have something in him that is, let's call it his "I", that is, the kind of thing that remains and if there<sup>2</sup> and is there all the time, can tell you, can really tell you what to do, how to talk, how to communicate, how to live how to be (word unclear) and if this, as music (a little unusual for you) can help to remind you of that, perhaps, in that sense as an emotional quality, it will have value. I would say it is enough, it doesn't matter for the rest. It doesn't matter what else you may get one way or the other, as long as you have a feeling that you wish to remain alive. So now what you do with that? Is it running? Huh? You need this for the other one? Ya?

end